



PATENT

Case Docket No. ASMEEX.137C1  
Date: September 30, 2002

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Raaijmakers  
Appl. No. : 09/584,656  
Filed : May 30, 2000  
For : APPARATUS FOR THERMAL  
TREATMENT OF  
SUBSTRATES  
Examiner : Leonard R. Leo  
Group Art Unit : 3743

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked  
attachments are being deposited with the United States  
Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope  
addressed to: United States Patent and Trademark  
Office, P.O. Box 2327, Arlington, VA 22202, on

September 30, 2002

(Date)

Adeel S. Akhtar  
Adeel S. Akhtar, Reg. No. 41,394

RECEIVED

OCT 10 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

## TRANSMITTAL LETTER

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 2327  
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing in the above-identified application are:

- (X) A Request for Reconsideration in 5 pages.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.

Adeel S. Akhtar  
Registration No. 41,394  
Attorney of Record



PATENT

LD  
10-11-02  
121 #12

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Raaijmakers

) Group Art Unit 3743

Appl. No. : 09/584,656

Filed : May 30, 2000

For : APPARATUS FOR THERMAL  
TREATMENT OF  
SUBSTRATES

Examiner : Leonard R. Leo

) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all  
) marked attachments are being deposited with  
) the United States Postal Service as first-class  
) mail in an envelope addressed to: United States  
) Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 2327,  
) Arlington, VA 22202, on

) September 30, 2002

) (Date)

) *Adeel S. Akhtar*  
) Adeel S. Akhtar, Reg. No. 41,394REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED

OCT 10 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 2327  
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 30, 2002, please reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the following remarks:

REMARKS

The Examiner has continued to reject all of the pending claims as being anticipated or under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

All of the Examiner's rejections are based upon the Examiner's refusal to give patentable weight to functional language related to "high temperature treatment of substrates," "allowing treatment of the substrate upon the support structure" and "configured to support a substrate in a process chamber during high temperature processing." If the Examiner were to give due weight to this language, then the rejections cannot stand.

Applicant traverses the rejections and submits that they are based upon legally incorrect findings that the claim language cannot be given any patentable weight. The Examiner seems confused between giving weight to functional language as a method or step limitation, and draws